



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

LCC:ddj  
Docket No: 4586-99  
19 January 2000

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 19 January 2000. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinion furnished by CMC memorandum 1001 MMEA-6 of 30 November 1999, with one enclosure, a copy of which is attached.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinion. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director

Enclosure



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS  
3280 RUSSELL ROAD  
QUANTICO, VIRGINIA 22134-5103

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1001

MMEA-6

30 NOV 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF  
NAVAL RECORDS

Subj: BCNR DOCKET NO. 04586-99 CASE OF S [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Encl: (1) MMEA-6 ltr 1040

1. We have reviewed Staff Sergeant Bove requested for full separation pay and recommend that you deny this request. The basis for denial is outlined in detail in the enclosure.
2. Specifically, [REDACTED] did not demonstrate the high standards of professionalism and integrity required of a staff noncommissioned officer. In Staff [REDACTED] case, the nature and severity of this offense outweighed his current performance. Key to this decision was the fact Staff Sergeant Bove violated our Core values.
3. Point of contact is Captain M. P. Cody, DSN 278-9239.

*W.B. Crowe*  
**W. B. CROWE**  
**BY DIRECTION**

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT DIVISION on OLAC-5C r/s of 6 Aug 99

Subj: CONGRESSMAN BILL GOODLING WRITES CONCERNING [REDACTED]

SUBJ: REENLISTMENT/SEPARATION PAY

1. [REDACTED] requested reenlistment on 10 May 1999. We responded to his request by denying him further service on 25 June 1999. The basis for denial was his failure to meet the minimum reenlistment prerequisites. Specifically, Staff Sergeant [REDACTED] did not demonstrate the high standards of professionalism and integrity required of a staff noncommissioned officer.
2. [REDACTED] record received the thorough consideration of 13 officers and staff noncommissioned officers. Their evaluation of his performance record resulted in the difficult conclusion that he did not warrant further service. Key to this decision was the fact Staff Sergeant [REDACTED] violated our Core values. In particular, he attempted to fraudulently enlist an applicant known to have a medically disqualifying condition. Furthermore, he encouraged the applicant to cover-up this medical condition.
3. The decision to deny a Marine further service is not taken lightly. However, [REDACTED] actions left no alternative. He failed to demonstrate the integrity and professionalism expected of a Marine, especially a Marine on recruiting duty who is a public figure and under scrutiny of the public eye. Despite the favorable endorsement by his current commander, we are obligated to take into account the Marine's entire record on current contract in reaching our decision. In [REDACTED] case, the nature and severity of this offense outweighed his current performance. His conduct was contrary to our core values and set a poor example to the public of how a Marine should conduct himself.
4. In denying [REDACTED] further service we assigned him a reenlistment eligibility code of RE-3C. This reenlistment code is warranted because he no longer meets reenlistment prerequisites. Additionally, Staff Sergeant [REDACTED] was authorized involuntary separation pay at the one half rate. Per MCO P1900.16E, Marine Corps Separation and Retirement Manual and SECNAVINST 1900.7G, Separation Pay for Involuntary Separation from Active Duty, a Marine must be completely qualified for reenlistment in order to receive full separation pay. Based on

ENCLOSURE (1)

Subj: CONGRESSMAN BILL GOODLING WRITES CONCERNING STAFF SERGEANT  
[REDACTED]  
SUBJ: REENLISTMENT/SEPARATION PAY

[REDACTED] failure to maintain the performance standards expected of a staff noncommissioned officer, he rendered himself unqualified for retention per MCO P1040.31H, Enlisted Career Planning and Retention Manual. Staff Sergeant [REDACTED] is only entitled to separation pay at the one half rate.

5. Point of contact is Captain [REDACTED], DSN 278-9239.